



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

50

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,528	05/31/2001	Shu-Chun Jeane Chen	SOM919990018US1/1963-7359	6756

7590 04/20/2005

WILLIAM E. LEWIS
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,528

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Dustin Nguyen

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

K

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 34 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (1) Craig discloses that a student workstation may depart from a synchronized lecture, and the disclosed statement of "the intended operation of the invention, however, requires no further input from the student beyond the initial download and connection to the presentation" which teaches away from the new amended limitation.
4. As to point (1), Craig teaches the above limitation as part of his invention so that it provides a "hands free" operation mode for user. The focus of Craig's invention is to provide a synchronized presentation of slides over a computer network [col 2, lines 65-67] and to configure to respond to interactive input from a user modifying the stated of the presentation [col 16, lines 66-col 17, lines 5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2154

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Craig [US Patent No 6,173,317].

7. As per claim 1, Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a computer network for simultaneously sharing images and data in a presentation with individual scan and reset by a plurality of viewers/users, comprising:

a) a server coupled via the network to a plurality of computers for purposes of conducting the presentation [Abstract; and Figure 3];

b) a selecting apparatus coupled to the network and selecting one of the computers as a leader user client computer [i.e. instructor], the remaining computers serving as audience user

Art Unit: 2154

client computers [i.e. student] [70-74, Figure 3; col 2, lines 64-col 3, lines 20; and col 8, lines 33-47];

c) a transmitting apparatus coupled to the server and transmitting the presentation as a series of web pages from the server to the leader user client and audience user client computers [i.e. synchronize] [Abstract; and col 3, lines 44-57]; and transmitting one or more web pages of the series of web pages to one or more audience user client computers in response to one or more audience user client computer requests received throughout the presentation [i.e. continue synchronizing application by retrieve and display] [Abstract; col 13, lines 29-35; and col 16, lines 66-col 17, lines 5]; and

d) a displaying apparatus at the leader user client and audience user client computers which displays each web page [Figure 2; and col 3, lines 28-31] including a time line table identifying each web page displayed in the presentation [i.e. slides] [52, 54, Figure 2; and col 8, lines 47-53].

8. As per claim 2, Craig discloses

e) a web page identification apparatus which identifies the location of each web page in the presentation by a Uniform Resource Locator in the time line table [54, Figure 2].

9. As per claim 4, Craig discloses

f) a storage apparatus which stores web pages transmitted by the server to the audience user client computers [78, 80, Figure 3].

Art Unit: 2154

10. As per claim 5, Craig discloses

g) a reset apparatus in each audience user client computer enabling a viewer/user to select a different web page than the current web page displayed at the audience user client computers [i.e. sync. slide] [56, Figure 2; and col 8, lines 64-66].

11. As per claim 7, Craig discloses

i) browser software stored in the leader user client and audience client computers for interacting with the server [col 3, lines 1-20].

12. As per claim 8, Craig discloses wherein the web page is in the HTML format [col 5, lines 62-col 6, lines 2].

13. As per claim 9, Craig discloses wherein the network is the Internet [col 6, lines 8-16].

14. As per claim 10, Craig discloses wherein the server uses HTTP protocol [col 6, lines 3-8].

15. As per claims 16 and 17, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 2.

16. As per claims 19, 20, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4, 5.

Art Unit: 2154

17. As per claims 23 and 24, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 2.

18. As per claim 26, Craig discloses program instruction in the medium storing web pages transmitted by the server in a cache associated with each audience user client computers [col 3, lines 58-col 4, lines 15].

19. As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 3, 6, 11-15, 18, 21, 22, 25, 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig [US Patent No 6,108,687], in view of Chaddha et al. [US Patent No 6,173,317].

22. As per claim 3, Craig does not specifically disclose wherein the web page identification apparatus further identifies each web page in the presentation by a caption in the time line table.

Art Unit: 2154

Chaddha discloses wherein the web page identification apparatus further identifies each web page in the presentation by a caption in the time line table [i.e. annotate] [Abstract; Figure 5; and col 2, lines 47-61]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Craig and Chaddha because Chaddha's teaching would provide a detail description of the presentation in a efficient manner.

23. As per claim 6, Chaddha discloses

h) an entering apparatus in the leader user client and audience user client computer which enters successive URL's and corresponding web page captions in the time line table as the presentation progresses [Figures 7, 8A and 8B; and col 6, lines 63-cl 7, lines 14].

24. As per claim 11, Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a server for simultaneously sharing images and data in a presentation with individual scan and reset by a plurality of viewers/users, comprising:

b) a presentation tier installed in the memory which interfaces with leader user client and audience user client computers via a network in receiving and responding to requests from the leader user client and audience user client computers throughout the presentation [i.e. applet, GUI] [102, Figure 4, 122, Figure 5; col 12, lines 59-67; and col 16, lines 27-30];

c) a business logic installed in the memory which processes and responds to the requests received by the presentation tier [i.e. LoadLectures, LoadSlides] [104, 106, Figure 4, 124, 126, Figure 5; and col 11, lines 16-31];

Art Unit: 2154

d) visitor object software installed in the business logic tier which tracks each request received by presentation tier [i.e. socket] [Figures 4 and 5; and col 10, lines 66-col 11, lines 6]; and

e) a database server interface which provides web pages in a presentation to the leader user client and audience user client computers in response to requests from the leader user client computer [Figure 3; and col 9, lines 42-54] and provides one or more of the web pages to one or more audience user client computers in response to one ore more audience user client computer requests received throughout the presentation [i.e. continue synchronizing application by retrieve and display] [Abstract; col 13, lines 29-35; and col 16, lines 66-col 17, lines 5].

Craig does not specifically disclose

a) a memory coupled to a processor, a network adapter and a database via a data bus.

Chaddha discloses

a) a memory coupled to a processor, a network adapter and a database via a data bus [Figures 1-3; col 3, lines 64-col 4, lines 9; and col 4, lines 17-23 and lines 53-58].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Craig and Chaddha because Chaddha's teaching would allow to store and communicate information in a diverse environment.

26. As per claim 12, Craig discloses

f) an application services objects partition including software setting up the sharing of images and data by the leader user client and audience user client computers [col 14, lines 1-19].

27. As per claim 13, Craig discloses

g) leader interaction application installed in an application services object partition, the software implementing requests from the leader user client computer to the server and responding to the leader user client requests by the server [122, Figure 5; and col 16, lines 66-col 17, lines 6].

28. As per claim 14, Craig discloses

h) audience interactive application software installed in an application services object partition, the software implementing requests from the audience user client to the server and responding to the audience user client computers by the server [102, Figure 4; and col 12, lines 29-34].

29. As per claim 15, Craig discloses

i) visitor object software which processes requests from the leader user client and audience user client computers and determines whether the requests is a setup application or leader interaction or audience interaction request and directing the request to the determined application for processing and response to the requesting leader user client computer or to the audience user client computer [Figure 6; and col 14, lines 44-col 15, lines 5].

30. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.
31. As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.
32. As per claim 22, Craig discloses storing browser software in the leader user client and audience client computers for interfacing with the server [i.e. applet] [col 4, lines 32-34] and forming a web content page are, a time line table area [Figure 2]. Craig does not specifically disclose a caption area in a screen. Chaddha discloses a caption area in the screen [Figures 6 and 7; and col 6, lines 22-34]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Craig and Chaddha because Chaddha's teaching would allow to provide detail information while efficiently utilizing the network resources and consuming minimal computation cycles on the client computers [Chaddha, col 2, lines 21-24].
33. As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.
34. As per claim 28, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.
35. As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 22.
36. As per claims 30-34, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 11-15.

Art Unit: 2154

37. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100